



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

gium and France. Hence the apparent miracle (but really quite natural fact) facing the world, that whereas when the armistice was signed the United States had become residuary legatee of the German "hate," today, by reason of the magnanimous, formal policy of its military representatives in the occupied regions of the former empire, and more especially because of the brotherly attitude of the rank and file of the army toward the children of the occupied territory, the mood of the adult population is changing. Stranger things have happened than that in the course of time, and that perhaps soon, there should be a disposition in Germany to welcome aid from the American forces in joint resistance to the anarchism and "terrorism" which have in Lenine, Liebknecht, and Rosa Luxemburg their symbolic, personal apostles of license and class war.

Nor can there be any full consideration of the large problem in social psychology and post-war phenomena all too inadequately dealt with above without taking into account the superb service rendered to the cause of international brotherhood and ultimate unity of peoples by the labors of the American Red Cross and associated American civilian agencies, that in Belgium, France, Italy, Serbia, Palestine, and Mesopotamia have done so much to conserve life midst populations facing death from starvation, extinction of domiciles, and lack of fuel and food. Much of the popular adoration and love which has welled up in such an unprecedented way from the heart of the masses of Europe as they have welcomed the President of the Republic to the continent and lined the routes over which he has traveled to the great urban national capitals have been due to his symbolic character as a leader of a people who will give money lavishly for the salvation of the children of the world and who will send forth armies of trained social workers versed in all the technique of scientific philanthropy.

As the privates and officers who have been in France, Belgium, invaded Northern Italy, Serbia, the Near East and the Far East return to their homes in every State of the union and in communities small and large they are not going to lose their interest in the wee folk whom they have made their "little brothers." Many of them have formally adopted their former wards. But all of them will be "publicity" agents for relief campaigns.

THE LEAGUE FOR RECONSTRUCTION

AT THE recent conference held at Atlantic City, at which representatives of four hundred war service committees, formed during the war under the direction of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, met, they agreed upon a post-armistice, post-war reconstruc-

tion program. They formally voted that raw materials and industrial equipment possessed by the United States and urgently required by the Allies should be shared generously with them, and that these foreign nations and former rivals should be provided with the necessary credit fund to make the required payments. The American business men decided that ocean tonnage not required for the use of American troops overseas or to carry food for the people of war-devastated regions, whether that tonnage be American or of countries associated with the United States in the war, should be "entered in the common service of all nations;" so that humanity everywhere may satisfy its demand for foods, raw materials to use in manufacturing, and ways and means for transporting both raw materials and manufactured goods.

Similarly pacific in tenor, breadth of view, and international good will were the utterances and formal resolutions of the Southern Commercial Congress, held at about the same time in Baltimore, where the speakers—many of whom were prominent federal officials who had handled problems of maintenance and conservation of food and export of goods during the war—as well as debaters on the floor, also rose to a higher altitude of vocational and national vision than often was the case at meetings of similar commercial organizations during the pre-war period.

Any student of the economic condition of the world today who can depreciate either the good sense or the good-will of such an attitude on the part of representative business men is free to do so, for whatever motives he may openly assign or covertly cherish; but most economists, publicists, captains of industry, and geniuses of administration—at least those of them who are of the calibre of Messrs. Hoover and Davison—will have only words of commendation for such a reconstruction program. They know that it is only by a most inclusive and strictly enforced form of co-operation between the nations that problems of finance, extension of credit, rationing of peoples of the earth, and restoring of trade and commerce to their normal functions can be carried on. Hence even now, prior to a formal agreement on terms of peace and definition of the political federation of the world, they have practically brought into existence a league of nations to save Europe from starvation and bankruptcy by mobilizing the resources of the Americas and the other continents that have escaped most, if not all, the ravages of the military side of the war. This they have done "for the good of the world."

Consequently Paris is a place where men like Hoover, Hurley, Baruch and Davison now gather; and while Wilson, Clemenceau, Lloyd-George, and Orlando have been both pupils and teachers in the school of co-opera-

tive statecraft, and have been feeling their way toward a federation of nations that will be chiefly political—using that word in the largest sense—the less vocal, less spectacular personalities of Hoover and his associates have been quietly creating precedents for the statesmen and diplomats to follow—precedents of give and take, and subordination of national “interests” to the common good.

When it is recalled how much of the warring of the past has been due to ultra-nationalism, competition for a limited supply of food and control of shipping and trade routes, against which this new trade league has been formed to fight at a time when such strife is generally conceded to be folly, it will be conceded that its formation is a significant detail of the work now being done in Paris.

One result of the war and of the strain on its political, military and financial structures which France has undergone may be a revision of its constitution. Whither shall it turn for a model? It is interesting to note that Joseph Reinach says: “In 1871 we crossed the Channel and endeavored to adapt the English Constitution to democracy, with a president instead of a king. In 1919 we must cross the Atlantic and recover for our own use the American Constitution, the product of eighteenth century France, and, in the main, of Montesquieu. The great merit of the American Constitution is that it has made real the separation of powers, on the one hand by a strong executive power drawing its strength from the fact that it is elected by the nation; and on the other hand by the Supreme Court which protects the fundamental principles of liberty and equality against all attacks, even on the part of the legislature. The American army crossed the ocean to help save, along with the soil of France, the liberty of nations and the right. French politics must cross the ocean to make the Republic that which it ought to be—the concern of the whole people.

Louis Kossuth, in speaking to Congress, the Supreme Court and the Cabinet of 1852, said that the United States had proved “the glorious practicability of a federative union of many sovereign states all conserving their state rights and their self-government, and yet united in one;” and, he added, “Your fundamental principles have conquered more in seventy-five years than Rome by arms in centuries. Your principles will conquer the world.” This Hungarian leader continued with other comments on the future of Europe as shaped by the influence of the United States, comments which indicated clearly that he had prescience, that hall mark

of the real prophet. Unfortunately Russia blocked Kossuth’s career as a builder of the state he hoped for; and when the Magyars came to power they chose the lower rather than the higher way.

Those persons most conversant with the history of the deliberations of the first Hague Conference will best appreciate the significance of the story that Prince Albert of Monaco tells about the former Kaiser’s attitude toward that assembly. Says the Prince in his letter to his disgraced and dethroned cousin: “You disclosed to me one day your real thoughts upon this noble movement in remarking to me with a smile that you were happy to participate in the Czar’s conferences, but did so by appointing as your delegates the most vigorous German generals.”

How the vocabulary of the deeper ranges of religion is being drawn upon these days to describe the attitudes and deeds of nations. “Sin,” “forgiveness,” “righteousness,” “atonement,” and similar words of the prophet and the preacher fall naturally from the lips of statesmen, jurists, journalists and soldier heroes. To illustrate, the *London Daily Mail* referred to the President of the United States as visiting Great Britain on an errand of “international consecration.”

In the Third Epistle of St. John he informed Gaius that he had many things to write unto him, but was unwilling to use pen and ink in so doing. Lacking such means of communication as a telephone, John voiced the hope that he would see Gaius “shortly,” and then, said he, “we shall speak face to face.” The President also seems to have had the same distrust of writing, and has preferred the “face-to-face” process of what he calls “matching minds.”

The Index to Volume LXXX (1918) of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* is now in preparation and will be sent free of expense to any applicants. In no previous year of the journal’s career has such a guide been a chronicle of such momentous events so prophetic of accomplishment of the ends for which the *ADVOCATE* has sought for generations.

It was a Hanoverian, Count Munster, who said of the constitution of the Russian autocratic régime that it was “absolutism tempered by assassination.” The phrase fits precisely as well the ochlocratic régime of the Bolsheviks.